Answering a Kritik

The purpose of a kritik is to indict an assumption made by your opponent.

The framework establishes what you’re talking about should be evaluated before the substantive debate.

The link establishes how a debater ties into what the kritik criticizes.

The impact is why what you’re doing is bad.

The alternative is what should be done to avoid what is being criticized, such as reject your opponent and his terminology.

Answering the framework: Make very specific arguments about why the kritik does not come before anything else. Either run normal debate good or kritikal debate bad.

Answering the link: Make a no link argument. Link them into it. Run link-turns.

Answering the impact: Impact turn the argument, link them into it, or outweigh.

Answering the alternative: Perm the alternative to non-unique all harms of the kritik. Perms can either be “do both” because they aren’t mutually exclusive or a perm that acknowledges contradictions but says they’re good. If a perm doesn’t work, try to turn the alternative by saying rejection makes the problem worse. If that doesn’t work, object to the alternative theoretically. Vagueness is a good place to start because it restricts turn-ground for the other side. Another way to generate theory is to make the argument that nontopical counterplans are unfair.

General theory answers to kritiks: K’s are bad. (K’s are bad because they’re infinite. K’s are bad because they give Neg access to literature not bound to the topic. K’s are bad because they distract us from real-world pragmatic consequences, but instead, we play into intellectual elitism.) Kritik the kritik. (Control the direction of the link debate, and argue that your opponent should be rejected.) Elevate the 1AC to a kritikal level and explain why your advocacy is just as important.

In the 1AC, set yourself up for answering kritiks by making an argument that demonstrates how you intended to function on a metadebate level all along.